

Charlottesville Route 29 Bypass Update

July 26, 2011

Background

- CTB approved Location & Design – April 17, 1997
- FHWA approved FEIS on January 20, 1993
- FHWA issued ROD on April 8, 1993
- FHWA approved Final Supplemental EIS on May 29, 2003
- Project Construction phase not in MPO TIP or CLRP (expected 08/11)
- Project Construction phase not in VDOT SYP (expected 08/11)

Environmental

- FHWA will most likely require an Environmental Assessment (EA) level re-evaluation including public involvement (based on June 16, 2011 VDOT-FHWA meeting.)
- FHWA will require updated traffic forecasts and new air and noise studies based on the updated traffic (based on June 16, 2011 VDOT-FHWA meeting.)
- Strategy – utilize on-call NEPA consultant, Parsons Transportation Group (PTG), to prepare the re-evaluation
- Timeline
 - Procurement: 3 weeks
 - Update Traffic data: approximately 3 months if done by PTG, possibly less if done by L&D on-call consultant
 - EA preparation and associated studies: 3 months from delivery of updated traffic data
 - Public Involvement: 3 months
 - Revised EA: 3 months
 - Total: ~ 13 months
- One of the commitments from the completed NEPA process is to complete 2 phase III archeological data recovery studies. While these probably won't need to be done to complete the reevaluation we may elect to do the work at the same time. This is an issue we will need to sort out with FHWA.
- Environmental Challenges:
 - Traffic often takes longer than the consultant says it will
 - We have to get FHWA's concurrence, in writing, to prepare a reevaluation
 - We will need to update our cultural resource work, the coordination for which will take time and may result in the need to bring in consulting parties.
 - We may need to prepare an MOA for already-completed CR work. That will likely lengthen the time required to reach closure on the EA.

Right of Way

- Right of Way Acquisition –authorized August 20, 1997
- 83 of 122 parcels purchased
- VDOT manages and leases 35 acquired properties
- Outstanding Acquisition to clear project
 - UVA State owned and Foundation parcels
 - City of Charlottesville property
 - Rivanna River Water Authority property
 - CSX Railroad Agreement
 - 23 Private properties
 - 18 – 23 graves to be relocated on parcels already acquired
- CSX Railroad Agreement will take a minimum of 6 months to secure
- Strategy: Authorize VDOT ROW staff to restart acquisition process to secure remaining properties and relocate graves while Project Delivery work is progressing.
- Authorize and fund Demolition contracts to begin clearing corridor of existing structures while Project Delivery work is progressing.

Project Delivery Strategy

- Utilize On-call Consultant (PB) to review existing design for adequacy, develop estimate and produce Design-Build RFP. Use aerial photography, depict EIS-approved corridor limits and previously purchased rights of way on the photograph. Existing plans to be used for information only. Verbalize work to be done in RFP. Advertise using single-phase, low bid Design Build strategy. Retain PB's services as Owner's Engineer for review of all D-B submittals and any engineering-related D-B issues that occur during construction.
- *Anticipated total (PE, R/W & CN) cost estimate – \$436,000,000 ± 15%*
 - PE Cost @ 7% \$ 20,000,000
 - R/W Cost \$ 70,000,000
 - CN Cost \$280,000,000
 - CEI @ 8% \$ 23,000,000
 - Contingencies @ 10% \$ 28,000,000
 - SWM, Utilities, Lighting \$ 15,000,000
- *Anticipated schedule*

| <i>Anticipated schedule</i> | <i>Anticipated Date</i> |
|--|-------------------------|
| ▪ Amend STIP, TIP & CLRP | 08/11 |
| ▪ FOPI | 08/11 |
| ▪ Begin NEPA Doc re-evaluation | 08/11 |
| ▪ Public Involvement (if needed) | 09/11 |
| ▪ Risk Analysis | 09/11 |
| ▪ Evaluation Panel | 08/11 |
| ▪ RFP Evaluation Criteria | 08/11 |
| ▪ Conflict of Interest | 08/11 |
| ▪ Estimate due from On-call | 09/11 |
| ▪ DBE Goal | 08/11 |
| ▪ OTJ Goal | 08/11 |
| ▪ Fed Criteria Sheet receive from On-call | 08/11 |
| ▪ FHWA L/A Mod. Approval? | 09/11 |
| ▪ CTB L/A Mod. Approval? | 09/11 |
| ▪ Traffic Analysis Reevaluation | 09/11 |
| ▪ IJR Determination | 09/11 |
| ▪ GDR | 09/11 |
| ▪ Pavement Design | 09/11 |
| ▪ ROW Footprint Identification (if using exist. Plans) | 08/11 |
| ▪ Design Approval | 04/97 |
| ▪ Special Provisions receive from On-call | 09/11 |
| ▪ RFP Information Package receive from On-call | 09/11 |
| ▪ RFP Part 2 receive from On-call | 09/11 |
| ▪ Advertise RFP | 09/11 |
| ▪ Mandatory Pre-Proposal Meeting w/Offerors | 10/11 |
| ▪ Mandatory Pre-Proposal Util Mtg w/Offerors | 10/11 |
| ▪ RFP Questions due to VDOT | 11/11 |
| ▪ Organizational Structure Changes Submission | 11/11 |
| ▪ VDOT Responses to Questions or Clarifications | 12/11 |
| ▪ Proprietary Meetings | 12/11 |
| ▪ Proposal Due Date | 02/12 |
| ▪ Open Price Proposals | 02/12 |
| ▪ Issue Notice of Intent to Award | 02/12 |
| ▪ Receive CTB Approval | 03/12 |
| ▪ Execute Design-Build Contract | 04/12 |
| ▪ Issue Notice to Proceed | 04/12 |
| ▪ Complete NEPA Doc re-evaluation | 09/12 |

| ROUTE 29 BYPASS PRELIMINARY MAJOR RISKS ITEMS | | | | | | | |
|---|---|------------|--------|------|--------|--------|------|
| Potential Risk Description | | Likelihood | | | Impact | | |
| | | Low | Medium | High | Low | Medium | High |
| 1 | Geotechnical data is insufficient to determine amount and integrity of rock excavation required. This will influence the cost of rock excavation, the earthwork quantities, and slope design. Contract will add cost of this risk to the bid. | | | X | | | X |
| 2 | The approved Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (FSEIS) needs to be re-evaluated. Proposed schedule has NTP prior to re-evaluation completion. Contractor will add cost of this risk to the bid. | | X | | | X | |
| 3 | The southern interchange at Route 250 was originally designed to accommodate 2022 traffic volumes. New traffic projections could overload the current design (weave between Ivy Road interchange and EB to NB flyover directional ramp). | | | X | | | X |
| 4 | The interchanges at each end may require approval from FHWA in the form of interchange justification reports and revised Limited Access breaks. This could result in extensive review time, design adjustments and associated delay and cost. | | | X | | X | |
| 5 | Land use and topographic conditions change and may require design adjustments and additional RW compensation. | | | X | | X | |
| 6 | Utility adjustment/coordination requirements are undefined. Major utilities requiring consideration are power transmission lines and two gas lines (0.2 m and 0.15m) that will need to be lowered approximately 12 m. | | | X | | | X |
| 7 | Severely compressed schedule drives delivery method, increases chance of contract errors and compromises our negotiation strength. Single phase, low-bid Design Build contract is likely to create Industry criticism due to contract size and short response periods. VDOT has only used this type of contract on small, relatively simple projects. Overlap of proposed schedule with Federal Obligation Design Build projects requires participation of less experienced VDOT staff. | | | X | | | X |

CONFIDENTIAL